

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

BILL ROMANOWSKI,

Plaintiff,

No. C 06-6575 PJH

v.

ORDER

RNI, LLC, et al.,

Defendants.

Before the court is a second request for an extension of dates with respect to defendants' motion for summary judgment. The original hearing date was continued due to a conflict in defense counsel's schedule. Based on the new date, plaintiff's opposition brief is due December 26, 2007, a date plaintiff can apparently meet. Defendants' reply brief is due January 2, 2007, but defense counsel requests a two-day enlargement of this deadline because of his holiday plans. He instead would like to file the reply brief on January 14, 2008, which he believes, "should provide the Court with sufficient time to review all of the briefing in advance of the January 16, 2008 hearing."

The Local Rules for the Northern District of California require that reply briefs be filed fourteen days in advance of the hearing for a reason. It might surprise defendants' counsel to know that defendants' motion is not the only matter on this court's very busy calendar for January 16, 2008, nor is it the only matter needing this court's attention during the first few weeks of the new year. And while the days remaining, should the continuance be granted, may be sufficient for a review of the briefs, the court assumes that defendants expect that the court will review the numerous exhibits that they have submitted as well. Counsel for defendants is advised that it is for the court, not him, to determine how to manage its

1 docket.

2 Nonetheless, the court will grant the request. Defendants should, however, not
3 expect similar accommodations in the future.

4 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

5 Dated: November 30, 2007



PHYLLIS J. HAMILTON
United States District Judge